R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 595 JC 660 232

STATE JUNIOR COLLEGES--HOW CAN THEY FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY. REPORT OF A SEMINAR ON STATE-ADMINISTERED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES (UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, LEXINGTON, OCTOBER 10-12, 1965).

BY- JOHNSON, BYRON LAMAR
SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD, ATLANTA, GA.

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.56 39P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *STATE PROGRAMS, *ADMINISTRATION, ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, *GOVERNANCE, *COMMUNITY COLLEGES, ATLANTA, LEXINGTON

THE SEMINAR ADVANCED THE THESIS THAT STATE-CONTROLLED JUNIOR COLLEGES CAN BE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND ACHIEVE THE AMERICAN IDEAL OF EDUCATING EVERY CITIZEN TO HIS HIGHEST POTENTIAL. A STATE SYSTEM OF CONTROL CAN BEST COORDINATE JUNIOR COLLEGE ACTIVITIES AND CURRICULUM, THUS (1) AVOIDING DUPLICATION OF COURSES OFFERED BY DIFFERENT SCHOOLS IN THE SAME AREA, (2) REDUCING INTERDISTRICT RIVALRY, (3) PROVIDING CERTAIN KINDS OF SPECIALIZED PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE, (4) AVOIDING UNREASONABLE DEMANDS OF LOCAL POLITICIANS AND PRESSURE GROUPS, AND (5) PROVIDING EQUITABLE FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. SUCH A SYSTEM MUST NOT BECOME TOO INFLEXIBLE IN ADAPTING TO LOCAL NEEDS, OR TOO READY TO SUBMIT TO STATE POLITICAL PRESSURES IN THE PLACEMENT OF SCHOOLS OR THE APPOINTMENT OF STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION. (AD)

ED012595

ERIC JC 660 232

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 1 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

STATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

HOW CAN THEY FUNCTION EFFICIENTLY?

JC 660 232

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

STATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

HOW CAN THEY FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY?

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

A report of a seminar sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board at Carnahan Conference Center, University of Kentucky

Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 / 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction v

Participants in Seminar vii

CHAPTER 1

The Junior College: An Analysis of Trends . . . 1

CHAPTER 2

State-Controlled Junior Colleges:
Values, Problems, and Proposals 13

CHAPTER 3

State Controlled—But Rooted in the
Local Community 25

INTRODUCTION

There is a dearth of published material concerning two-year public colleges which are administered by the state government (either directly or through a state university) rather than by a local government unit. This is surprising when one considers the large amount of attention which has been given to community junior colleges in recent years.

Despite the lack of attention to state-administered junior colleges in the literature, there is no lack of the state-administered institutions themselves. A number of states throughout the country have junior colleges which are supported and administered by the state government. Five of these are located in the Southern region.

Recognizing that the problems with which state-administered institutions are confronted often are different from those facing locally administered institutions, the Southern Regional Education Board arranged a two and a half-day seminar devoted exclusively to the state-administered two-year college. The seminar met October 10-12, 1965, at the University of Kentucky's Carnahan Conference Center. Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education at the University of California at Los Angeles, and a noted authority on the junior college movement, was asked to prepare two background papers to set the stage for the discussions at the seminar. These constitute Chapters One and Two of this publication.

The seminar itself was devoted to a lively and constructive discussion of many problems, possibilities, and issues associated with the effective functioning of state-administered two-year colleges. At the close of the seminar, Dr. Johnson summarized the discussion, and his summary, in an edited and revised form, constitutes Chapter Three.

The seminar was attended by people familiar with the two-year systems in each of five Southern states which have state-administered two-year college systems in operation—Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Virginia. A limited number of others familiar

with the junior college movement also participated. As Dr. Johnson comments in his summary, an immediate rapport was established which enabled the seminar to give its attention to a number of basic questions. The success of the seminar is attributable to the active and constructive participation of the people in attendance, and to the important contributions made by Dr. Johnson, not only in his prepared presentations, but also in his participation during the course of the discussions.

President John W. Oswald of the University of Kentucky served both as a gracious host and an active participant in several working sessions.

The Southern Regional Education Board hopes that this volume will help fill a current gap in the literature on state-administered or university-administered junior colleges.

WINFRED L. GODWIN, *Director*
Southern Regional Education Board

PARTICIPANTS

Seminar on State-Administered Community Junior Colleges

ALABAMA

Dr. Fred L. Wellman
Assistant Professor
Educational Administrator
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

GEORGIA

Dr. Louis C. Alderman, *President*
Middle Georgia College
Cochran, Georgia

Dr. Harry S. Downs
Coordinator of Junior Colleges
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Dr. Galen N. Drewry, *Director*
Institute of Higher Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

KENTUCKY

Dr. Robert Goodpaster, *Director*
Ashland Community College
Ashland, Kentucky

Dr. Ellis F. Hartford
Coordinator of Community Colleges
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. John W. Oswald, *President*
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Dr. James S. Owen, *Director*
Elizabethtown Community College
Elizabethtown, Kentucky

OKLAHOMA

Dr. Bruce G. Carter, *President*
Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College
Miami, Oklahoma

Dr. E. T. Dunlap, *Chancellor*
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. Dan S. Hobbs
Educational Programs Officer
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

VIRGINIA

Dr. H. Wescott Cunningham, *Director*
Christopher Newport College
Newport News, Virginia

Dr. Sherman S. Dutton, *Director*
University of Virginia
Patrick Henry Branch
Martinsville, Virginia

Dr. Dana B. Hamel, *Director*
Department of Technical Education
Richmond, Virginia

Mr. Jan LeCroy, *Research Assistant*
Commonwealth of Virginia
Higher Education Study Commission
Richmond, Virginia

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Dr. A. J. Brumbaugh, *Consultant*
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. James L. Miller, Jr.
Associate Director for Research
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Dr. Raymond E. Schultz, *Director*
Professor of Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

CHAPTER 1

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE:

An Analysis of Trends

We have no national system of education in the United States, for, historically, education is a function of the respective states. Accordingly, we have varied separate systems of education in our nation. Within a series of diversified operations we do, to be sure, have cooperative endeavors of the type carried out, for example, by the Southern Regional Education Board. Increasingly, we also have Federal support for education. By and large, however, we continue to have—and, indeed, to take pride in—diversified plans for education.

A. Propositions Which Condition the Kind of Education We Need in America

And yet in our democratic society, we are seeking a unity through diversity. It is axiomatic that education must emerge from the basic philosophy and commitments of the nation which it serves. With this in mind, and also as a background for our consideration of junior college trends, I would like to propose four propositions which must condition the kinds of education we need in America:

Proposition 1: The ideal of democracy is to permit each individual to be educated to the level of his highest potential. This is of central importance, not only because of its value to the state and to society, but also and more particularly because democracy is committed to the overriding importance of every human personality. The development of the individual—each citizen and each citizen in preparation—is and must be a goal, a value in and of itself, entirely apart from any contribution such achievement may make to the state as such.

Proposition 2: Individuals differ widely in their range and types of abilities. This proposition needs no defense. The findings of psychology and the observations and experience of all of us confirm the fact of individual differences. Variations occur not only in results of the type that are measured by so-called intelligence tests, but also in such other types of aptitude—or as some would suggest "other types of intelligence"—as mechanical, artistic, musical, clerical, and so on.

Studies which are being conducted in all parts of the world will lead to a fuller understanding of intelligence and aptitudes—what they are—some of their relationships—and particularly perhaps, their implications for teaching and learning, for school organization and administration. In the meantime, on the basis of existing knowledge and insights, we can and must proceed to act on our present understanding of individual differences.

Proposition 3: A democracy must provide a wide range and a diversity of education to meet the requirements of widely varied individuals. Someone has suggested that our task is and must be educating "all and each." This includes the physician and the farmer, the housewife and the librarian, the secretary and the salesman, the musician and the lawyer, the mechanic and the businessman, the nurse and the teacher, the engineer and the technician.

The differences in individuals—their abilities, interests, and goals—require different approaches to education. We need both varied types of institutions and differentiation within given schools and colleges.

Proposition 4: Variety in education and the ideal of educating everyone to the level of his highest potential are consistent with the demand for excellence in education. In elaborating on this proposition I should like to quote John Gardner, former President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in President Johnson's cabinet:

> . . . as things now stand the word excellence is all too often reserved for the dozen institutions which stand at the very zenith of our higher education in terms of faculty distinction, selectivity of students, and difficulty of curriculum. In these terms, it is simply impossible to speak of a junior college, for example, as excellent. Yet, sensible men can easily conceive of excellence in a junior college.
>
> The traditionalist might say, "Of course! Let Princeton create a junior college and one would have an institution of unquestionable excellence." That may be correct, but it leads us down precisely the wrong path. If Princeton Junior College were excellent in the sense that Princeton University is excellent, it might not be excellent in the most important way that a community college

can be excellent. It would simply be a truncated version of Princeton. A comparable meaningless result would be achieved if General Motors tried to add to its line of low-priced cars by marketing the front half of a Cadillac.

We shall have to be more flexible than that in our conception of excellence. We must develop a point of view that permits each kind of institution to achieve excellence in terms of its own objectives.[1]

. . . we must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must learn to honor excellence (indeed, to *demand* it) in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity, and to scorn shoddiness, however exalted the activity. There may be excellent plumbers and incompetent plumbers, excellent philosophers and incompetent philosophers. An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity, will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.[2]

These propositions clearly point to the need for diversified institutions of higher education to meet the needs of widely varied individuals in contemporary America. Among these is not only the university and the liberal arts college—but also, and occupying a place of increasing importance, the junior college. With this background in mind, I propose now to discuss the questions: What manner of institution is this? And in particular, what are the major trends in junior college development?

B. Two-Year College Trends

What manner of institution is this? I am referring to an educational institution which offers two years of work beyond high school. In addition, however, we may characterize the junior college by referring to seven current trends in its development.[3]

1. *The junior college is expanding with almost explosive rapidity.* In the words of one observer, "Junior has grown up." Twenty-five years ago junior college enrollments totaled 267,000. Today, more than 1,100,000 students are attending the two-year colleges of our nation. In 1940, 58,000 were enrolled in the junior colleges of the 16 states

---

1. John W. Gardner, "Quality in Higher Education," *Current Issues in Higher Education,* Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Higher Education (1958), p. 12.
2. *Ibid.,* p. 15.
3. In this presentation I shall interchangeably use the terms junior college, two-year college, and community college to refer to the same institution.

represented on the Southern Regional Education Board. Now, there are more than 200,000 students in the junior colleges of these states. In other words, junior college enrollment in these Southern states today is but little smaller than the total national enrollment a quarter of a century ago.

Junior may have grown up, but the end is not yet in sight.

Several years ago I corresponded with 49 leaders of American thought including representatives of labor, government, education, industry, and the professions. In response to my query—"What is likely to be the most significant junior college development of the forthcoming 25 years?"—43 respondents referred to expansion of enrollment.[4] These were among the expressions used: "consistent expansion," "vigorous growth," "tremendous growth," and "a 'boom market' for the junior college." Several letters suggested that by 1980 junior college graduation will be as common as high school graduation is today.

And there are, indeed, forces which move in this direction.

In 1960 the President's Commission on National Goals recommended that two-year colleges be placed within commuting distance of all high school graduates, except those in sparsely settled regions.[5]

The Educational Policies Commission asserts, ". . . the nation's goal of universal opportunity must be expanded to include at least two further years of education, open to any high school graduate."[6]

Consistent with the findings of national committees and commissions is the recommendation of the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South: "Each state should develop a strong system of two-year commnunity colleges."[7]

Trends in growth, national requirements for manpower and the democratic ideal of promoting maximum development for every citizen unite in demanding and predicting unprecedented future growth for the two-year college. Conservative estimates suggest a doubling of junior college enrollments by 1975 and some predict a trebling.

2. *The junior college is assuming sharply increased responsibility for preparing students for upper division work at universities and other senior institutions.* When junior colleges were first established, their

---

4. B. Lamar Johnson, "A Look to the Future," *The Public Junior College*, Fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 299-319 and pp. 304-306.
5. President's Commission on National Goals, *Goals for Americans* (New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 7 and p. 91.
6. Educational Policies Commission, *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond High School* (Washington, National Education Association, 1964), p. 6.
7. Southern Regional Education Board, *Within Our Reach*, A Report Prepared by the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South (Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1961), p. 16.

single purpose was to offer two years of work acceptable to universities. Even the term, junior college, implies the function to be served. At the second meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1922, the junior college was defined as "an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade." The single goal was to prepare students for transfer, as advanced students.

Joliet, Illinois, Junior College, founded in 1902, was the first public junior college to be established which is still in existence. It was started under an agreement whereby the University of Chicago accepted two years of work done by students at the extended high school in Joliet.

Although preparation for transfer is no longer the only purpose of the junior college, recent events highlight the importance of this objective. Studies reveal that the two-year college prepares students for successful upper division work. It is, therefore, inevitable that as college and university enrollments skyrocket, the junior college will be expected to assume increased responsibility for the freshman and sophomore years.

In Florida in 1964, classes opened in a new and different kind of state university. Offerings at this institution are limited to upper division, professional, and graduate work. To the junior colleges of Florida is assigned responsibility for the lower division preparation of students who attend Florida Atlantic University. Florida has authorized and provided funds for planning a second upper division university in Pensacola.

Writing under the title, "Higher Education in the 21st Century" in the June, 1963, issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, Alvin C. Eurich foresees that by the year 2000 strong liberal arts colleges and universities will have discontinued their first two years, since these will come "almost wholly within the province of the junior colleges."

3. *The junior college is assuming major responsibility for technical-vocational education.* Despite its importance, preparation for transfer is by no means the only purpose of the junior college. It also has responsibility for occupational education, general education, and adult education.

There is evidence that preparation for employment is, in all sections of the country, recognized as an important responsibility of the two-year college. In reporting a survey of curriculum developments in 116 junior colleges in the North Central Region of the country, President Isaac Beckes of Vincennes University states, "Those who have been calling for more comprehensive programs will find much for encouragement in reports from the 116 colleges."[8] In his survey Beckes identified

---

8. Isaac Beckes, Address given at Conference of North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, March, 1963.

191 new programs in occupational fields including 25 in electronic technology, 24 in data processing, 18 in nursing, and six each in law enforcement, distributive education, and medical technology.

A publication of the California State Department of Education lists 101 occupation-centered curricula in California two-year colleges under such headings as agriculture, business and commerce, health, technical, and the arts.[9]

4. *The trend is definitely toward the comprehensive junior college which includes in a single institution preparation for employment and education for transfer.* The need for junior college post-secondary technical-vocational education is quite clear; similarly, the need for expanded education for transfer in our junior colleges is clear. But, some argue, technical-vocational education should be provided in one institution and education for transfer in another. Those who hold this position suggest that it is difficult and perhaps impossible effectively to provide technical-vocational programs and transfer programs in the same two-year college.

There are those who have had similar doubts about the comprehensive American high school. It was with this in mind that James B. Conant in the late Fifties studied the American high school. In introducing the report of his study, Conant raised about the high school the question which some today raise about the junior college: "Can a school at one and the same time provide a good education for *all* the pupils as future citizens of a democracy, provide elective programs for the majority to develop useful skills, and educate adequately those with a talent for handling advanced academic subjects—particularly foreign languages and advanced mathematics? The answer to this question would seem to be of considerable importance for the future of American education. If the answer were clearly in the negative, then a radical change in the structure of American public secondary education would be in order . . . On the other hand, if the answer is in the affirmative, then no radical change in the basic pattern of American education would seem to be required."[10]

In discussing the reason for his study, Conant pointed out, "I was curious to discover not only whether in a comprehensive high school the interest of the minority who are academically able were well protected, but also whether it was possible for such a school to provide a satisfactory program for developing certain vocation skills . . ."[11]

---

9. California State Department of Education, *Technical Education in the California Junior Colleges* (Sacramento, California State Department of Education, 1963).
10. James Bryant Conant, *The American High School Today* (New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1959), p. 15.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Following his investigation, Conant without equivocation answered the question he had raised: "The question I set out to answer, I can now answer in the affirmative."[12]

In his foreword to Conant's report, John W. Gardner, at that time President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, commented on the scope and significance of the Conant study.

> The focus of Mr. Conant's study is the "comprehensive" high school—a peculiarly American phenomenon. It is called comprehensive because it offers, under one administration and under one roof (or series of roofs), secondary education for almost all the high school age children of one town or neighborhood. It is responsible for educating the boy who will be an atomic scientist and the girl who will marry at eighteen; the future captain of a ship and the future captain of industry. It is responsible for educating the bright and the not so bright children with different vocational and professional ambitions and with various motivations. It is responsible, in sum, for providing good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, for all young people within a democratic environment which the American people believe serves the principles they cherish.
>
> There are those who say it cannot be done. When a man like James Conant says it *can* be done, the nation must take notice.[13]

There is an analogy between Conant's conclusions regarding the comprehensive American high school and the desirability of the current trend toward the comprehensive junior college. The multi-purpose two-year college can be expected to play a vital roll (a) in preparing students for transfer, (b) in preparing them for immediate employment in technical and semiprofessional positions, and (c) in retraining adults for new jobs created in our age of automation. In the multi-purpose junior college, a student may, if desirable, move directly from an occupational curriculum to a transfer curriculum, or vice versa, without changing colleges. Furthermore, in such a college, the transfer student can achieve understanding of vocational fields and the vocational student will have an opportunity for general education.

The evidence suggests that the comprehensive junior college—like the comprehensive high school—is both desirable and feasible. Indeed, Merson goes so far as to suggest, "One can measure the strength of a community college by the diversity of its program." He further observes, "Fortunately, increasing numbers of two-years colleges are

---

12. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
13. John W. Gardner, "Foreword," in *The American High School Today*, pp. ix-x.

broadening their offerings to correspond with the range of interests of those they enroll, and with the needs of society."[14]

5. *The junior college is an "open door" college.* By this I mean that any high school graduate is eligible for admission to most junior colleges—and also, in California and several other states, anyone over 18 years of age who can profit from instruction offered at the college. The concept of the open door college is consistent with our ideal of educating every citizen to the level of his highest potential. It should also be pointed out that this concept recognizes the fact that many young people are "late bloomers." They deserve a second chance, even after a mediocre high school record. Large numbers of these late bloomers go on to successful careers and leadership in business, the professions, and government.

In his national study of junior colleges with enrollments of more than 400, Scherz reports that eight out of ten junior colleges admit any high school graduate, and almost half of these admit anyone over 18 who can profit from the instruction they offer.[15]

The fact that a student is admitted to a junior college does not, of course, imply that he is eligible to take all courses and curricula offered at the college. On the contrary, a number of programs are highly selective. Admission to programs in dental assisting, data processing, electronics, and registered nursing are, for example, typically restricted. Some colleges provide special courses for students with low academic ability—and limit the study of such students to these offerings. In a recent trip, during which I visited more than 30 colleges in 12 states, I was impressed with the serious attention two-year colleges all over the nation are giving to remedial instruction.

It is difficult to defend the admission of all comers unless we provide offerings and counseling adapted to the requirements of our instructors. The study skills center at Valley College is being observed by officials of the Los Angeles College District as a likely prototype of a unit planned, on a larger scale, for inclusion in the learning center of the new junior college soon to be established in West Los Angeles.

I have referred to curriculum and instructional developments reported by colleges as they give realistic recognition to the fact that the public junior college is an open door college. It is difficult to defend the admission of all comers unless we provide offerings and counseling

---

14. Thomas B. Morton, "The Community College: Theory and Practice," Address given at Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon, April 18, 1963.

15. Robert F. Scherz, "An Investigation of Junior College Courses and Curricula for Students With Low Ability" (unpublished Doctor of Education dissertation, University of California, 1963), p. 44.

adapted to the requirements of our clientele. If we fail in this, the junior college in reality becomes a revolving door college.

6. *Guidance is recognized as an important responsibility and, some would assert, goal of the junior college.* The California Junior College Association included guidance as a purpose of the junior college in the list of goals which it prepared for use in the Restudy of Higher Education in California. In my own thinking guidance is a means to an end—rather than a goal in and of itself. Nevertheless, this is such an important responsibility—and is so recognized—that I single it out for a special comment.

The need for guidance is highlighted by the fact that the junior college is, as we have noted, an open door college. In his book, *The Open Door College*, Burton Clark identifies what he calls the "cooling-out function" of the junior college—a term which he has borrowed from the literature of gambling and of psychiatry.[14] Upon occasion the confidence man, after having fleeced his victim, has a responsibility for leading him to understand and accept the reality of the situation in which he finds himself—in other words, to come to a realization of the reality of his "fleecedness." This is designated as the "cooling-out role" of the confidence man.

Clark suggests that the junior college has a somewhat similar responsibility for leading many of its students to face the reality of their situations. They come to college with high ambitions or hopes to enter medicine, teaching, engineering, or law—fields for which they are eminently unqualified. The junior college has an obligation to help such students achieve a self-understanding on the basis of which they can make realistic educational plans.

The magnitude of this task is suggested by the fact that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the students who enter our junior colleges announce their intention to transfer to senior institutions, whereas less than one-third actually continue their education beyond junior college graduation. We have the paradoxical situation of students taking programs and working toward goals for which they are not qualified. Too often these students are wasting much of their time and energies, burdening their instructors, and retarding the progress of their classmates. This situation is particularly regretful because in a major number of cases students are qualified for other programs in their own college.

This problem does not, of course, have its roots in the junior college. Rather it emerges from a contemporary society which places its stamp of prestige upon a university degree. Parents cherish for their

---

14. Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College* (New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1960), pp. 160-163.

sons and daughters and young people for themselves the rewards of a prestige curriculum.

Nor is this problem unique to the United States. I find it literally in all parts of the world.

While visiting nation members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, I was repeatedly told that Great Britain has been so successful in building the prestige of its universities that a serious problem has been created. Countless young people are taking programs which lead only to a university, whereas their talents might appropriately be directed toward other fields of study—fields in which, in many cases, there is a pressing national demand for qualified workers.

In India, the British heritage of university training is attracting the enrollment of unprecedented numbers in university programs for which they are not qualified and in programs which have little relevance to the pressing needs of their poverty-stricken nation. I find similar situations in the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Egypt, Southern Rhodesia, France and Italy.

The difficulty which we face in enrolling junior college students in programs for which they are qualified is a national and, indeed, a world problem. In comprehensive junior colleges we have three advantages which I fail to find in most other parts of the world. First, we have a flexibility in our programs which makes it possible for students to transfer from one curriculum to another; second, we have a variety of offerings which are adapted to the qualifications of students with diverse types and ranges and achievements; and, third, we have testing and counseling services through which expert assistance can be provided to students as the junior college performs its guidance function.

7. *The junior college is a community college.* By this I mean that the offerings and programs of junior colleges are planned to meet the needs of their communities—and also to elicit the participation of citizens in program planning, development, and operation. As a relatively new unit of our educational system, the two-year college is not handicapped by restrictions of the heavy hand of tradition. It can provide—in addition to education for transfer—curricula adapted to local requirements. This results in junior college programs in petroleum technology in the oil fields of Texas; in agriculture in the wheat fields of Kansas; in a medical secretary program at Rochester, Minnesota; in fashion design in the garment manufacturing center of New York City; in citri-culture in Southern California; in insurance and banking in the financial center of Chicago; in forestry in Northern Idaho—and we might go on listing community-centered programs—as well as reporting the participation of lay citizens through advisory committees, for example, in program planning and development.

Importantly, the two-year college also provides education—including technical-vocational education—for adults; sponsors forums, concerts, art exhibits, and varied cultural activities; and serves as a vital, coordinating educational agency for its entire community.

C. Conclusion

The junior college has been referred to as the most dynamic unit in American education. Analysis of its notable growth and projections for the future provide support for this view.

But the junior college must be more than a sharply expanding institution. It must realistically contribute to the ideal of our democratic society that every citizen should be educated to the level of his highest potential. The trends which we have examined suggest that the two-year college is increasingly committed to the values projected by Walt Whitman when he wrote:

> The American compact is altogether with individuals,
> The only government is that which makes minute of individuals,
> The whole theory of the universe is directed to one single individual—namely to you.

These lines represent a high ideal for our nation, for American education, and particularly for the community junior college.

CHAPTER 2

STATE-CONTROLLED JUNIOR COLLEGES:

Values, Problems, and Proposals

We have noted the trend toward the comprehensive junior college which includes programs that prepare students for immediate employment as well as those that prepare for transfer to senior institutions. We have also observed that the junior college is increasingly an open door college, that it provides guidance and is a community college—an institution the programs of which are adapted to the needs of the community it serves. The two-year college clearly has an important role to play in American higher education. But there is diversity between and among junior colleges. Some are large, some small; some are urban, some rural; some are tuition free, some charge high tuition. Many public junior colleges are locally controlled and supported; others are state-controlled and administered.

Much of the literature of the junior college assumes that the only desirable method of administrative control for the two-year college places major responsibility for control in the local community. I need not here go into the advantages claimed for—and many of them are valid and notable—the locally controlled junior college. I need simply point to the fact that, within our national pattern of diversity in higher education, some states have state-controlled systems of junior colleges.[1]

---

1. It should be noted that even in states with local control, junior colleges may be required to conform to state regulations concerning such matters as admission, retention and dismissal of students, staff qualifications, curriculum, student affairs, financial management, and building plans. In Florida and North Carolina state agencies exercise a degree of control over two-year colleges and also provide notable leadership for assistance to these institutions.

Most of these are unlikely, at least in the foreseeable future, to give up state control for local control—or even for shared community-state control. And yet these states have a need for comprehensive community colleges—just as do their sister states with locally controlled two-year colleges.

I would like to advance the thesis that it is possible for state-controlled junior colleges to be comprehensive, community colleges. As a matter of fact, this thesis states an assumption which underlies the planning of this seminar.

A. Patterns of State Control

But even in state-controlled plans, patterns of organization differ. Before discussing values, problems, and proposals in state control, I shall briefly refer to the organizational plans for the five Southern states which have this type of control. My reference to these plans will be brief, for during the seminar we shall have more extensive reports from the respective states.

In Alabama, the State Board of Education is responsible for operating and maintaining the public junior colleges of the state.

Georgia's junior colleges are administered by the Board of Regents for the University System.

In addition to one locally controlled community college, Kentucky has nine community colleges which are branches of the University of Kentucky.

Seven of Oklahoma's 12 public junior colleges are state-controlled and supported. Five of these are under the Board of Regents for Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges, and two have their own governing boards. All are a part of the Oklahoma System for Higher Education, the board of control for which is the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The remaining five junior colleges in Oklahoma are municipal institutions. There is no state support for municipal junior colleges in Oklahoma, and these institutions have not flourished.

Virginia's 11 public junior colleges are two-year branches of three senior institutions: College of William and Mary, University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

In two of the states represented at this seminar, Kentucky and Virginia, public junior colleges are branches of senior institutions. In Georgia two-year colleges are under the University regents and in Oklahoma junior colleges are under the State Regents for Higher Education. Only in Alabama are junior colleges under the State Board of Education.

Several of these states also have specialized institutions which offer post-secondary vocational education. In Alabama, vocational-technical schools are under control of the State Board of Education—the body which is also responsible for junior colleges. Georgia has area vocational schools which are administered by the State Department of Education. Virginia has a Board of Technical Education which is charged with establishing and operating technical colleges. The legislation which authorized these colleges include, however, this provision:

> When, and at such time as, a comprehensive community college system is instituted in Virginia, these institutions may become comprehensive community colleges.

Although this seminar is not primarily concerned with the relationships of junior college to specialized vocational schools, I do want to point out the need for coordinated state planning which includes both junior colleges and specialized vocational schools. On another occasion in discussing state plans for technical-vocational education, I asserted:

> Any plan should provide for the coordination of and avoid needless duplication in post-secondary programs of technical-vocational education. Due apparently to historical accidents, two separate and at times competing systems of post-secondary technical-vocational education have developed in several states. For example, a system of vocational schools—largely post-secondary in character—may be under one agency of a state department of education and the community colleges under a completely separate agency. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to engage in state-wide planning under which new institutions will be located where they will be of greatest service. Similarly, coordinated planning to avoid the overlapping of offerings is fraught with problems.[2]

The values of coordinated state planning are obviously important among the advantages claimed for state-controlled plans for administering junior colleges. Similarly, coordinated planning is necessary between and among junior colleges and specialized vocational schools.

B. Advantages of State-Controlled Plans for Administering Junior Colleges

I now invite your attention to some advantages claimed for state-controlled plans for administering junior colleges and then to problems associated with such plans, and suggestions for meeting them.

---

2. B. Lamar Johnson, "Alternative Patterns for Post-Secondary Technical-Vocational Education," *Technical-Vocational Education and the Community College,* Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board (Williamsburg, Virginia, 1964), p. 8.

In preparing this section of my presentation I have corresponded with several leaders in, and students of, state systems of junior colleges.[3] In discussing advantages of, problems in, and suggestions for state systems I shall in part—but only in part—draw upon this correspondence. I shall also draw upon my observations of developments in Hawaii, where I recently spent a month working with those who are responsible for community college developments in that state. What is happening in Hawaii is pertinent to this seminar, for on July 1, four technical schools of that state became a part of the University of Hawaii. They are to become comprehensive community colleges and to serve as the nucleus for a projected state-wide system of community colleges.

Among the advantages claimed for state-controlled junior colleges are these:

1. A state-controlled plan of junior college administration encourages effective state-wide planning for junior colleges. This advantage of state-controlled plans was mentioned more frequently and with greater emphasis than any other in my correspondence. Under such a plan two-year colleges can be located where they are most needed, and programs can be planned in such a way as to avoid costly, needless duplication of offerings.

Richard Kosaki, Vice President of the University of Hawaii, discusses this value, in part from the viewpoint of a political scientist:

> . . . some of the discussions of state-versus-local control make the mistake of handling this problem as though the factors of state control were ends in themselves . . . What I think should be given prime consideration—viewed as a goal—is the desired type of educational system. We may never get complete agreement on this (but perhaps "general" agreement, such as whether we should have public community colleges in the state, and this is important), so we fall back on establishing a procedure whereby our desirable goals can be gained. In our society, we think that the procedure which allows the effective participation of the greatest number of people to be affected is best. I am reluctant to accept this position because (a) control is not always a matter of simple organizational charts or geographic proximity; it is often a matter of "interest,"

---

3. These include Rudolph Davidson, Consultant, Higher Education, State of Alabama Department of Education; Harry S. Downs, Coordinator of Junior Colleges, Regents of the University of Georgia; E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education; Dana B. Hamel, Director, Department of Technical Education, Commonwealth of Virginia; E. T. Hartford, Dean, Community College System, University of Kentucky; Donald H. Hermann, Coordinator of Branch Colleges, College of William and Mary; Richard H. Kosaki, Vice President in Charge of Community Colleges, University of Hawaii; James L. Miller, Jr., Associate Director for Research, Southern Regional Education Board; and Fred L. Wellman, Assistant Professor of Education, Auburn University.

> and I find increasingly a greater interest in state and national politics over local politics (the election turn-outs are a crude measure); and (b) our goal is not primarily control at a certain level but a good overall system, and increasingly we find that we get better results for our money and efforts through effective coordination rather than isolated operations.[4]

2. A state-controlled plan of junior college administration can be useful in reducing—and perhaps eliminating—inter-district rivalry. In the words of one administrator, "The state agency for junior colleges can act as an arbiter in disputes between and among junior colleges."

3. A state system of junior colleges administered on a professional basis can effectively resist the demands of local politicians and pressure groups. Since the seat of control is not in the community in which a college is located, it is suggested that unwarranted political and other pressures can be minimized under a plan of state control.

4. A state-controlled plan of junior college administration can provide equitable financial support for all junior colleges. In states which have locally supported and administered junior colleges, there may be great differences in the financial ability of communities to support their junior colleges and therefore wide variation in the quality of colleges—their plants, their programs, and their facilities. Under state plans it is claimed that programs of more nearly equal quality are available to students in all junior colleges.

5. A state-controlled plan of junior college administration can be helpful in making expert and specialized assistance available to junior colleges. This expertise may come from a university—in the case of university-operated two-year colleges. Or, in the case of control by a state department of education, it may be possible for junior colleges to secure appropriate assistance from that department and also from other agencies of state government.

In Kentucky it is pointed out that—under the University of Kentucky—junior colleges have available at an economical cost varied services and opportunities that contribute to improvement and enrichment of the educational program. Among these are participation in an educational television network, provision of highly qualified consultants for in-service education and curriculum development, assistance in institutional research, and centralized handling of student records and transcripts.

6. A state-controlled plan of junior college administration has, it is claimed, a number of advantages if this control is exercised by a university. In particular, it is pointed out, the prestige of a university may

---

4. Letter from Richard Kosaki, Vice President of the University of Hawaii, June 25, 1965.

have a notable value in establishing a desirable image for the two-year college. Also, university affiliation can be helpful in securing highly qualified faculty members.

In particular, however, university control facilitates effective working relationships between the junior college and the senior institution. In other words, such a plan aids the development of an effective transfer program and the acceptance of junior college courses in transfer.

C. Problems in State-Controlled Plans for Administering Junior Colleges

In considering the problems and difficulties associated with state-controlled plans for junior colleges, it is, of course, important to keep in mind the type of institution which is sought and desired. In this presentation, I am assuming—for reasons which I have pointed out—that our goal is a comprehensive, community college. With this objective in mind, I direct your attention to the following problems:

1. State control makes it difficult for a junior college to adapt to local requirements. In other words, it is held that state-controlled plans of administration inhibit the development of the junior college as a community college. Under state control, it is suggested, curricula and programs have a "sameness" rather than being adapted to the particular requirements of the communities which the colleges serve. It is also pointed out that since control is not at the local level, a college may not be readily responsive to community needs.

2. Since the junior college is a relatively young institution and is still in its developmental stage, flux and change are desirable and, indeed, important. This demands a freedom and flexibility of administration which, it is held, is difficult to achieve under state control. In the words of one of my correspondents, "State control inhibits freedom."

State control may inhibit local initiative and creativity and thereby hinder the optimum development of a college. If staff members on a campus are to function at the highest level of efficiency, it is essential that they have an opportunity to show initiative and that their views and recommendations be seriously considered in program planning and development. This problem is identified by Harris as he comments on the state-controlled technical schools of Hawaii which are now in the process of being converted into comprehensive junior colleges:

> Faculty members at the present technical schools feel that they have little to say about curriculum matters, and even less about budgetary matters. Whether this is true or not is beside the point —they strongly feel this way and the situation has had a negative effect on the personal professional development of the faculty member. "Decisions are made in Honolulu, not here," is the con-

> source of the neighbor island technical school faculties in the matter of decision making. The community college system should attempt to correct this situation.[5]

3. State control may result in undue political influence in locating a junior college campus. Several letters cited examples, under state control, in which political expediency rather than educational need dictated decisions regarding where to establish junior colleges.

4. State control may result in undue political pressure in appointing junior college presidents and other staff members. Some of my correspondents referred to situations in which presidents of junior colleges were appointed for primarily political reasons rather than because of their qualifications. In a few states I also find that political pressure is brought to bear on presidents in urging the appointment of faculty members.

5. State control may result in undesirable competition and jealousy between and among institutions. Political advantage rather than educational need may be the important factor in determining budgets and appropriations.

6. Plans for control under which junior colleges are affiliated with a university result, it is suggested, in undue attention to the transfer function of the two-year college and the consequent neglect of technical-vocational offerings. Although preparation for transfer may be over-emphasized under any type of control (including state control), it is suggested that junior colleges which are parts of university systems are particularly susceptible to giving undue attention to preparation for transfer—because the central purposes of a university focus upon advanced study and research. Junior colleges within such systems are in danger of being swept up by the current of traditional university trends. Several of my correspondents referred to this problem. Other university-affiliated correspondents exemplified this problem in their letters, as they expatiated on the importance of preparation for advanced work and completely neglected preparation for entering employment.

D. Capitalizing on Strengths and Minimizing Problems

It is clear that special values are claimed for state-controlled systems of junior colleges. It is also obvious that there are special problems associated with state control. Our aim should and must be to capitalize on the values and to meet and minimize the problems. With this in mind

---

5. Norman C. Harris, "Curriculum Development for Hawaii's Community Colleges, With Emphasis on Occupational Education" (Honolulu, Community College System, University of Hawaii, 1964), p. 46. (Mimeographed.)

I shall discuss two advantages which are claimed for and three problems which are associated with state-controlled junior colleges.

1. One of the values claimed for state-controlled plans of junior college administration is that this type of organization can be helpful in making expert and specialized assistance available to two-year colleges. If this advantage is to be realized to the fullest, it is essential to have in an important position in the agency of control an educator who is highly competent in and qualified to give leadership in the field of the comprehensive community college. It would ordinarily seem desirable to appoint to this position a man with extensive junior college experience. If, however, a man is selected who has little knowledge of the two-year college, he should be given opportunity to visit and study selected junior colleges throughout the nation, to attend conferences, to confer with leaders in the field—in short, to have the opportunity to become a real expert on the junior college through varied enrichment and learning experiences.

At the University of Hawaii, the Vice President for Community Colleges is the former chairman of the Political Science Department at the University. Prior to appointment to his present position he had little knowledge of the junior college. During the past two years, however, he has visited junior colleges, conferred with junior college leaders, and attended junior college conferences in all sections of the nation. He has engaged in a rigorous program of study and investigation. Today he is recognized as a knowledgeable expert on the community junior college.

2. State-controlled plans can encourage effective state-wide planning for junior colleges. If this important advantage is to be realized, thorough and scholarly state-wide surveys must be made as a basis both for planning the location and determining the order of priority in establishing two-year colleges. The recent Regents' Study on Community Junior Colleges in Georgia was made by a committee of educational leaders in that state, assisted by two out-of-state consultants. The findings of this study are to be used as a basis for locating new two-year colleges in Georgia.

If the advantages of state-wide planning are to be realized, it is, of course, essential that decisions regarding the establishment of junior colleges be made on the basis of educational considerations. Political domination of junior colleges must be resisted at all costs. If two-year colleges are established as a result of the activity of community or regional pressure groups, or as a result of political logrolling, the interests of our citizens and of our youth will suffer.

3. A fear is expressed that state control may inhibit initiative and retard the creative development of two-year colleges. One of the men

with whom I corresponded expressed the "greatest fear of a monolithic control agency of any kind, especially in relation to community colleges." He further explained, "The entire community college movement is still in its developmental stages. Constant flux and change probably represent its most identifiable characteristic. It would appear that any such movement requires the greatest freedom and flexibility if progress is to be assured."

The same correspondent suggests a resolution of this potential problem under plans of state control as he asserts, "The community colleges should be allowed the greatest possible freedom in developing admission policies, budget proposals, capital outlay plans, and curricula in order to best meet the educational needs of their community."

I heartily subscribe to these sentiments. To the greatest extent possible—within a framework of coordinated planning—autonomy should be granted the individual college as an aid to encouraging initiative and optimum program development.

In my recent correspondence, one respondent suggested as an advantage of a university-controlled system of junior colleges the fact that the two-year college shares the accreditation of the University. If this suggests that a junior college may be automatically accredited simply because it is administered by an accredited university, we will, I fear, be contributing to the dangers of monolithic control. We will, in a sense, be relieving the college and its faculty of a responsibility which they can and should assume—a responsibility for achieving accreditation on the basis of the program which they themselves have developed. In this connection I might mention that in Hawaii, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges is proposing to receive an application for accreditation from each separate community college—although each is a part of the University. This is representative of the type of autonomy that should be sought and granted to junior colleges in state systems under university control.

4. State control makes it difficult for a junior college to be a community college. In this connection I quote from a letter written by one of the educators with whom I corresponded in preparing this paper:

> Lack of local responsibility for financial support of junior colleges often leads to complacency on the part of citizens and groups, lack of response to college offerings, the tendency to look to the state capital for answers, loss of initiative, and other limiting factors . . . Probably the most fundamental weakness of a state system of junior colleges is the lack of responsiveness to local needs and community problems.

Practices which provide for local autonomy in program development obviously facilitate the emergence of the state-controlled junior

college as a community college. Under such a plan it is possible, with relative ease, to have offerings which are responsive to community needs.

Local college-wide advisory committees are used and found be helpful in Hawaii and Kentucky. Some use of such committees also made in Alabama, Georgia and Oklahoma report the use of advisory committees in connection with specific parts of college programs.

A semantic approach to the encouragement of community colges is used by the universities of Kentucky and Hawaii—each of which designates its two-year colleges as "community colleges."

5. There are special problems associated with developing and maintaining a comprehensive junior college under the control of a university. In particular there is a real danger that under university control, programs which prepare students for immediate employment will be neglected.

An educator from a state represented at this seminar has identified this problem as follows:

> If the program of studies is controlled by faculty and deans of a traditional senior college, it is difficult to get them to understand and/or accept the goals and purposes of a community college or, more specifically, the program necessary to attain such goals.

At the August Institute on Community Colleges in Hawaii, President Thomas Hamilton of the University of Hawaii discussed this problem quite frankly. In particular he pointed out that the fact that if the president of the university is concerned about the danger of neglecting technical-vocational education, this is one of the best possible assurances that offerings in this field will not be downgraded. President Hamilton reported examples of what is being done to maintain and indeed advance technical-vocational education in the community colleges of Hawaii under the administration of the University:

a. The community colleges of Hawaii are directly responsible to the President of the University through a Vice President for Community Colleges. Under this plan the two-year colleges are not under the control of the Academic Senate. Direct access to the President and through him to the Board of Regents is assured. Both the President and Vice President are committed to the central importance of technical-vocational education.

b. The first consultant to community colleges to be appointed by the university was an authority in technical-vocational education.

c. Administrators appointed to positions of leadership in the community colleges of Hawaii are committed to and, in many cases, have an extensive background in technical-vocational education.

d. Vocational advisory committees—both local and state-wide—are used in curriculum planning and development.

Plans somewhat similar to those in Hawaii are being followed at the University of Kentucky where the Dean of the Community College System is directly responsible to the President of the University and through him to the Board of Trustees.

E. Guidelines

It is clear that no single formula or plan will fit the requirements of all states with state-controlled junior colleges. Plans will and should vary from state to state. Nevertheless, it will be helpful to have guidelines as an aid to developing state-controlled junior colleges to the highest level of their effectiveness. Keeping in mind the background of our discussion I should like to suggest eight guidelines for use in developing comprehensive community colleges under a state-controlled plan of organization:

1. Make thorough and scholarly state-wide studies as a basis for planning the location of junior colleges.

2. Recognize that planning is a continuing process and not simply an event. Planning surveys must be kept up to date—remade from time to time to reflect changing conditions in our communities, our states, and our nation.

3. Make decisions regarding the location of two-year colleges and the provision of funds and facilities on the basis of educational needs and requirements—not on the basis of political expediency. At a time when school, college, and university enrollments overtax all of our facilities and at a time when excellence is required in education as never before, taxpayers have every right to demand one hundred cents in value for every dollar spent. Political logrolling must have no part in arriving at decisions regarding the establishment of junior colleges.

4. Establish a position—the incumbent in which is responsible for providing leadership for and coordination with and among junior colleges—which is recognized as important in the organizational hierarchy of the agency (whether that be a university or a department of state government) responsible for administering junior colleges. If the advantages claimed for state control are to be realized, it is essential that the person recognized as "the voice of the junior college" have a prominent place at the council table where policy and fiscal decisions are made.

5. Make certain that the person responsible for providing leadership and coordination to the two-year colleges is highly qualified in the field in which he is serving. It would ordinarily be expected this

person would have had successful junior college experience. If such should not be the case, he must be given an opportunity to study in the field and, in particular to get directly acquainted with developments in other states.

6. Draw upon the best available resources to provide expert consultation and assistance to junior colleges, both individually and collectively. Under state-controlled plans, qualified expert personnel from various departments of state government and/or from universities can be made available to advise and assist on those aspects of junior college development for which their particular expertise qualify them. In the event that experts required for some purposes are not available within the state, they should be brought in from outside its boundaries. In many cases modest expenditures for expert consultants have saved literally millions of dollars.

7. Assign to each junior college, major authority and responsibility for decisions regarding its programs and development. Local autonomy is necessary to the encouragement of the creative initiative which is essential for the optimum development of vital and effective junior colleges.

8. Involve citizens of the community where the junior college is located in program planning, development, and operation. In this connection, advisory committees of local citizens can be notably valuable. If major autonomy is given to a college, and if the staff of the college is responsive to the needs of the community, the junior college can in reality become a community college.

F. Conclusion

We have looked at problems and opportunities for junior colleges under state control. We have advanced the thesis that state-controlled junior colleges can be comprehensive community colleges. In particular we have suggested practices and guidelines designed—in state-controlled systems—to lead to the optimum development of the comprehensive community colleges which are required if the two-year college is most effectively to contribute to the achievement of the American ideal that every citizen should be educated to the level of his highest potential.

CHAPTER 3

STATE CONTROLLED—

But Rooted in the Local Community

The seminar of the past three days has in a sense been a nistoric occasion. It represents an unprecedented endeavor by the Southern Regional Education Board and by representatives of selected states to examine a type of state organization for the administration of junior colleges which is widely cited as a barrier to the effective development of such institutions. The spirit of the discussions here has not been one of defense nor has it been one of offense. The seminar has not been defending a view or a practice—nor has it been attacking the views or practices of others. Rather we have sought to examine a facet of administration in our respective states as a basis for understanding what is happening and in particular as a basis for action.

These sessions have been unusual in my experience in that as a group—newly assembled and in many cases strangers to each other—we have not spent long hours dotting i's and crossing t's as we argue about purposes and functions.

Underlying the discussions of the seminar has been the assumption that in projecting plans of organization and control, the goal is the establishment and development of comprehensive community junior colleges—institutions which offer two years of post-high school education, institutions whose programs are adapted to the needs of the communities in which they are located, and institutions which prepare some students for transfer to senior colleges and others for immediate employment.

Not once during the seminar was a voice raised to question the desirability of establishing, developing, and perpetuating comprehensive

community junior colleges. Since there was this agreement, it has been possible to concentrate attention on plans, problems, and procedures—rather than on functions and objectives. This circumstance has notably advanced our discussions.

The *theme* of the seminar has clearly been this: Under state control an effective system of comprehensive community colleges can be developed. The *spirit* of the seminar has been this: "Let's go!"

Discussions have, for the most part, been realistic in recognizing and facing problems and difficulties associated with state control. The point was made, however, that problems associated with state control may also confront two-year colleges under local control. The suggestion was made, for example, that overemphasis on the transfer function is not unknown in locally supported two-year colleges. Nor are unwarranted political pressure and logrolling in college affairs limited to institutions under state control. At one session, a member of the seminar waxed eloquent in explaining the possibilities and opportunities in state systems and asserted, "If I were 'starting from scratch,' if I were organizing junior colleges in a state for the first time, I would urge a centralized plan of state control."

Efficiency of operation, coordination in planning, and the provision of equitable financial support were the advantages most often cited for state operation. Noted was the fact that in a number of situations where community colleges are urgently needed, local citizens could not be depended upon to vote for the establishment and support of two-year colleges. Under state control, however, junior colleges can be and, indeed, have been established in such circumstances. In the words of one member of the seminar:

> It is doubtful that my state can develop an effective junior college program without strong state control. Our local communities lack the leadership, the understanding, and the motivation which are necessary for the establishment of junior colleges. We must look to the state for stimulation, support—and also for control.

As I have implied, the mood of the seminar has been one of hopeful optimism regarding the possible development of vital, comprehensive community colleges under state control. Nevertheless, problems and difficulties have been recognized.

With this background in mind I propose in the time at my disposal:

First, to discuss two problems which the seminar rated high in importance as obstacles to the effective development—under state control —of comprehensive community junior colleges.

Second, to discuss some facets of the operation of junior colleges under university control—since this type of organization is dominantly represented at the seminar.

Third, to make three recommendations which emerge from the deliberations of the seminar.

A. Two Problems

As members of the seminar considered plans for developing community junior colleges, the problem which gave them greatest concern was this: the difficulty, under state control, of developing junior colleges which are adapted to the requirements of the communities in which they are located. There is, it was pointed out, a danger that absentee control will result in a failure of a college to recognize and provide for the needs of the region in which it is located.

Five suggestions were made for meeting this problem:

1. Refer to two-year colleges as "community colleges" or as "community junior colleges." This proposal may seem to be superficial and inconsequential. Nevertheless, the name of a college can mean much in identifying its purposes and in establishing its image. The goals of the college must clearly be community centered. The name "community college" suggests this emphasis.

2. Make community surveys as a basis for identifying community needs—and utilize the findings of such surveys in curriculum planning and in program development. Citizens of the community can be involved to advantage in conducting surveys and in implementing their findings.

3. Develop extensive and effective programs of community service. Such programs may include concerts, forums, art exhibits, conferences, and workshops. They may involve the organization of community orchestras, choruses, and theater groups. College facilities can be used by all manner of citizen groups—as the college in reality becomes a cultural center for its entire region. In this connection, some colleges are building combination student centers and community centers.

4. Involve citizens of the community in service to and also gifts to the college. Qualified business and professional men and women can be invited to lecture at the college—meet with individual classes or address all-college convocations. Upon occasion they may teach part time—in the day or evening program. Community citizens can also be encouraged to make financial gifts to the college—for scholarships, or for the suppport of particular programs or even to pay for needed buildings.

5. Use lay advisory groups as an aid to program planning, development and operation. This particular proposal was discussed at greater length than any other considered by the seminar. Three types of advisory groups were identified:

a. A large group—ranging in size from 30 to 100—which meets once or twice a year to hear reports on college developments and perhaps to make suggestions regarding the college and its program. Such a group largely serves a public relations function. At times, however, useful recommendations emerge from meetings of such groups.
b. A formally organized and continuing advisory committee of from eight to 12 members whose purpose is to advise and assist the college regarding program developments, particularly as these reflect the needs of the community. A group of this type can meet regularly and frequently and can, in a sense, serve—though only in an advisory capacity—some of the functions of a local board of trustees.
c. An advisory group organized to make recommendations regarding a specific problem or area of college development. Such committees are most often used in projecting vocational programs. They may also, however, be used for other purposes—including planning a campus or a building, or organizing a conference, an orchestra, or a forum.

There was general agreement that local advisory groups can be useful. On the other hand, some members of the seminar reported unsuccessful experiences with such groups. At times advisory committees apparently feel that they are assembled simply to give perfunctory approval to plans already decided upon by college officials. And, of course, upon occasion a college administrator may actually assemble a committee for "window dressing" purposes. Such endeavors are usually predoomed to failure. If advisory committees are to serve a purpose they must be given an opportunity to consider problems and possible solutions—and then be expected to offer their advice and assistance. Advisory committees are not decision-making bodies. Their purposes and responsibilities must be made clear to them.

However, after advisory groups have made recommendations it is incumbent upon college officials to report to committee members what action has been taken regarding their proposals. If their advice is not followed, the reasons for the decision ultimately made by the college administration should be explained. If this is not done, advisory group members are likely to feel that their counsel is ignored and that they are wasting their time.

Although advisory committees can, upon occasion, serve useful purposes in helping to secure financial support for a college, this value of such groups was given little attention during the seminar. Rather the focus was on the use of advisory groups as an aid to a college in serving the particular needs of the community in which it is located.

All in all, the discussion of lay advisory groups revealed notable interest in such groups and a belief that they can be useful. However, comparatively little evidence of the effective use of these groups was reported.

The problem of adapting state-controlled junior colleges to the requirements of local communities is complex and difficult. The approach to meeting this problem most often proposed by members of the seminar were plans under which local citizens are actively involved in college affairs and operations—through community surveys, through programs of community service, through advisory groups, and through informal consultation. Regardless of the method, citizen involvement is essential.

A second major problem identified by members of the seminar relates to state-wide planning for post-secondary education. State control offers advantages as a basis for planning. At sessions of the seminar it was clear, however, that little is being achieved in one aspect of planning. I refer to the difficulty of planning efficiently when junior colleges are responsible to one state agency and area vocational schools —which, like junior colleges, offer post-secondary vocational education—are responsible to an entirely different agency. Under such circumstances an overlapping of functions and services is inevitable. Also inevitable is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Members of the seminar reported plans under which junior colleges are established adjacent to or near existing area vocational schools. In such situations it is anticipated that at some time in the future junior colleges may be combined with vocational schools—thus developing into comprehensive community colleges. This process is, it is pointed out, underway in North Carolina. In Hawaii, technical schools are currently expanding into comprehensive community colleges.

The seminar gave comparatively little attention to possible resolutions of the difficulty to which I have referred. Nevertheless, the problem is one of major concern to representatives of every state participating in the seminar.

B. Footnotes on University Control

In four of the five states represented at the seminar, junior colleges are a part of universities or are responsible to university systems. It was, therefore, natural that plans of university control would be discussed more than those of control by other state agencies.

Having junior colleges identified with a university can, it was pointed out, have value in establishing a desirable image of the two-year college. The value of university control as a means of facilitating

the transfer of students from the junior college to the senior institution was referred to frequently during the seminar. Reference was also made, however, to the fact that transfer is not limited to that which takes place from junior colleges to the controlling university. Junior college graduates will and should transfer to varied senior institutions. It is, therefore, incumbent upon junior colleges under university control to make particular efforts to establish working relationships with a variety of senior institutions.

Varied plans for helping junior colleges recognize that they are parts of a university were reported during the seminar. At one university, junior college faculty members are invited to the September reception for new staff members—just as are those who are on the central campus of the university. At this same university, university professors in sizable numbers—from 50 to 150 at a time—have attended and marched in academic processions at centennial celebration convocations held on junior college campuses.

Much discussed was the danger that, under university control, junior colleges may overemphasize transfer programs and neglect occupational offerings. Members of the seminar frankly recognized this as a problem. Plans which make two-year colleges directly responsible to the president of the university—through a vice president or dean for community colleges—were reported and advocated. Under this arrangement the possibly restrictive control of faculty bodies is bypassed.

From time to time during the seminar reference was made to some of the values that can accrue to a university when it is responsible for the administration of junior colleges. It was suggested that the development of community colleges within a university system can desirably affect the curriculum of the senior institution. University faculty members will, it was held, find it incumbent on them—when junior colleges are a part of the university—to examine and with greater precision and effectiveness define and categorize lower and upper division offerings. If this is not done, the functions of the junior college in relation to the university will be unclear.

It was also suggested that, under a university, junior colleges can serve as on-location outposts for the university as it carries forward varied state-wide programs in such fields as community health or agriculture.

The possible political value of junior colleges to a university did not go unnoticed. Two-year colleges scattered through a state—and under university control—can, during a legislative session, serve as a useful reminder of the functional outreach of the university as it serves citizens in all sections of its commonwealth.

I do not wish to minimize the values that a university may achieve through its administration of a system of community colleges. I do, however, wish to urge that any advantages which may accrue to a university cannot in and of themselves justify the operation and control of two-year colleges by the senior institution. Such operation and control must be justified on entirely other grounds—in particular on the basis of the quality of service that two-year colleges can offer to local communities when they are under university control. These are the values that have particularly been discussed during the seminar.

C. Three Suggestions

This has been an action-oriented seminar. It is, therefore, appropriate as we close our sessions that we consider the questions: What next? Where do we go from here?

Each of us has, during the past three days, achieved insights, understandings and suggestions that he will find useful in varied ways as he returns home. I am confident that the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board will study the proceedings of the seminar and project a number of follow-up activities.

I would like to present for your consideration three proposals for action which emerge from the deliberations of the seminar. These and other proposals which will occur to you might well be considered for joint action by the Southern Regional Education Board, the Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program, operated by the University of Florida and Florida State University, and the Southwestern Junior College Leadership Program operated by the University of Texas. These Junior College Leadership Programs received financial assistance from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and provide notable resources for leadership in areas of concern to this group.

1. Make a study of the function and operation of advisory committees as an aid to the development of community junior colleges. Such a study should include an analysis of achievements and failures of such groups. Emphasis should be given to innovating proposals—plans as yet untried or undreamed of. A seminar of the type we have had these past three days could be useful as a part of, or as preparation for, such a study as I suggest. Although the focus of this study should be on advisory committees in systems of state-controlled junior colleges, the findings would be useful to all two-year colleges.

2. Investigate further the potential of state planning for junior colleges. Such a study should capitalize upon the advantages which state controlled systems have in planning. Recognition should be given, however, to the dangers of political logrolling as a basis for reaching educa-

tional decisions—and to methods for combatting the unwarranted intrusion of politics into college affairs and operations. Recognition also should be given to the relationship of junior colleges and area vocational schools—and in particular to means of avoiding unjustified and costly duplication of services.

3. Study the role and functions of state directors or coordinators of junior colleges. In some situations an important position in the educational hierarchy of a state is assigned to the director or coordinator—or in the case of university systems, to the vice president or dean for community colleges. In other cases, however, little or no provision is made for state leadership in junior college development. Under such a condition one of the major values of a state-controlled plan is unrealized. If state plans are to achieve their potential, effective administrative leadership and coordination must be provided. Studies of—and perhaps a seminar on—the best means for doing this are needed.

Other proposals will undoubtedly occur to you. I particularly urge, however, the importance of studies and follow-up activities which look forward to (a) optimum use of advisory committees as an aid to developing community-centered colleges, (b) state-wide planning as a basis for making educational decisions and for avoiding indefensible duplication of services, and (c) highly qualified state leadership for junior colleges.

Through such efforts as these we will put into action the theme of this conference: Under state control an effective system of comprehensive community colleges can be developed. And through such efforts as these will we realize the ideal, "State-controlled—but rooted in the local community."